

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

**TYLER DIVISION**

<b>ALOFT MEDIA, LLC,</b>	§	
	§	<b>Civil Action No. 6:10-CV-256</b>
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	§	
	§	
<b>v.</b>	§	
	§	
<b>COMPUWARE CORP., et al.,</b>	§	<b>JURY TRIAL DEMANDED</b>
	§	
<i>Defendants.</i>	§	

**PLAINTIFF ALOFT MEDIA, LLC’S ANSWER TO DEFENDANT OPTIONSPRESS,  
INC.’S COUNTERCLAIMS**

Plaintiff Aloft Media, LLC (“Aloft”) responds to each of the numbered paragraphs of the Counterclaims of Defendant optionsXpress, Inc. (“optionsXpress”), as set forth in optionsXpress, Inc.’s Answer, Affirmative Defenses and Counterclaims to Aloft Media, LLC’s Original Complaint for Patent Infringement (Dkt. No. 45), as follows:

**THE PARTIES**

1. Aloft admits the allegations of paragraph 1.
2. Aloft admits the allegations of paragraph 2.

**JURISDICTION**

3. Aloft admits that optionsXpress purports to bring counterclaims for non-infringement and invalidity of U.S. Patent Nos. 7,593,910 (“the ‘910 patent”) and 7,596,538 (“the ‘538 patent”) (collectively, the “Patents in Suit”). Aloft admits that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over optionsXpress’s counterclaims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), 2201, and 2202, as well as the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.* Aloft denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 3.

4. Aloft admits the allegations of paragraph 4.

5. Aloft admits that it has submitted itself to this Court's jurisdiction by alleging, in the present lawsuit, that optionsXpress infringes the '910 and '538 patents. Aloft admits that an actual case or controversy between optionsXpress and Aloft exists. Aloft denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 5.

**COUNT I**  
**NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '910 PATENT**

6. Aloft restates and incorporates by reference each answer to paragraphs 1-5 above, but Aloft denies the allegations in those paragraphs unless specifically admitted therein.

7. Aloft denies the allegations of paragraph 7.

8. Aloft admits that optionsXpress purports to seek a declaratory judgment that it has not and does not infringe any claim of the '910 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Aloft denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 8.

**COUNT II**  
**INVALIDITY OF THE '910 PATENT**

9. Aloft restates and incorporates by reference each answer to paragraphs 1-8 above, but Aloft denies the allegations in those paragraphs unless specifically admitted therein.

10. Aloft denies the allegations of paragraph 10.

11. Aloft admits that optionsXpress purports to seek a declaratory judgment that each claim of the '910 patent is invalid for failure to satisfy one or more requirements of the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.* Aloft denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 11.

**COUNT III**  
**NON-INFRINGEMENT OF THE '538 PATENT**

12. Aloft restates and incorporates by reference each answer to paragraphs 1-11 above, but Aloft denies the allegations in those paragraphs unless specifically admitted therein.

13. Aloft denies the allegations of paragraph 13.

14. Aloft admits that optionsXpress purports to seek a declaratory judgment that it has not and does not infringe any claim of the '538 patent, either literally or under the doctrine of equivalents. Aloft denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 14.

**COUNT IV**  
**INVALIDITY OF THE '538 PATENT**

15. Aloft restates and incorporates by reference each answer to paragraphs 1-14 above, but Aloft denies the allegations in those paragraphs unless specifically admitted therein.

16. Aloft denies the allegations of paragraph 16.

17. Aloft admits that optionsXpress purports to seek a declaratory judgment that each claim of the '538 patent is invalid for failure to satisfy one or more requirements of the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.* Aloft denies the remaining allegations of paragraph 17.

**OPTIONSXPRESS'S PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Aloft denies that optionsXpress is entitled to any relief, and specifically denies all the allegations and prayers for relief contained in paragraphs A-F of optionsXpress's Counterclaims.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Aloft respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment denying and dismissing optionsXpress's counterclaims, and that the Court enter judgment in favor of Aloft as requested in Aloft's Original Complaint for Patent Infringement (Dkt. No. 1), as amended or supplemented.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Aloft, under Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, requests a trial by jury of any issues so triable by right.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eric M. Albritton", written over a horizontal line.

Eric M. Albritton  
Texas Bar No. 00790215  
ema@emafirm.com  
Adam A. Biggs  
Texas Bar No. 24051753  
aab@emafirm.com  
Debra Coleman  
Texas Bar No. 24059595  
drc@emafirm.com  
Matthew C. Harris  
Texas Bar No. 24059904  
mch@emafirm.com  
ALBRITTON LAW FIRM  
P.O. Box 2649  
Longview, Texas 75606  
Telephone: (903) 757-8449  
Facsimile: (903) 758-7397

Thomas John Ward, Jr.  
Texas Bar No. 00794818  
jw@jwfirm.com  
WARD & SMITH LAW FIRM  
P.O. Box 1231  
Longview, Texas 75606  
Telephone: (903) 757-6400  
Facsimile: (903) 757-2323

Danny L. Williams  
Texas Bar No. 21518050  
danny@wmalaw.com  
J. Mike Amerson  
Texas Bar No. 01150025  
mike@wmalaw.com  
Jaison C. John  
Texas State Bar No. 24002351  
jjohn@wmalaw.com  
Christopher N. Cravey  
Texas Bar No. 24034398  
ccravey@wmalaw.com  
Matthew R. Rodgers  
Texas Bar No. 24041802

mrodgers@wmalaw.com  
Michael A. Benefield  
Indiana Bar No. 24560-49  
mbenefield@wmalaw.com  
David Morehan  
Texas Bar No. 24065790  
dmorehan@wmalaw.com  
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.  
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100  
Houston, Texas 77042  
Telephone: (713) 934-7000  
Facsimile: (713) 934-7011  
  
*Attorneys for Aloft Media, LLC*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was filed electronically in compliance with Local Rule CV-5(a). As such, this document was served on all counsel who are deemed to have consented to electronic service. Local Rule CV-5(a)(3)(A). Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d) and Local Rule CV-5(d) and (e), all other counsel of record not deemed to have consented to electronic service were served with a true and correct copy of the foregoing by email and/or fax, on this the 12th day of August 2010.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Eric M. Albritton", written over a horizontal line.

Eric M. Albritton